DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 135 PS 013 490

AUTHOR Grant, Linda
TITLE The Socialization of White Females in Classrooms.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-14, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; *Females; Interviews; Longitudinal Studies; Peer Relationship; Sex Role; *Social Attitudes; *Socialization; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *White Students

ABSTRACT

Using qualitative methods (longitudinal observations and intensive interviews with teachers), this study examined in elementary classrooms the socialization over time of one race-gender group: white girls. Analysis focused on four domains of classroom social life that contribute to race-gender differentiated socialization: teachers' perceptions about white girls, teachers' behavior toward these children, children's behavior toward their teachers, and children's experience in peer interactions. It was found that, for the most part, white girls' socialization in classrooms encourages them to assume social roles traditionally played by white women rather than to seek alternatives. In conclusion, it is suggested that micro-stratification patterns within classrooms mirror stratification patterns of the larger society. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229135

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Socialization of White Females in Classrooms

by

Linda Grant

Department of Sociology

Southern Illinois University

Carbondale

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda M. Grant

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS013490

I appreciate aid in completion of this paper from Mark Chesler, Jacquelynne Eccles Parsons, Phyllis Blumenfeld, James Rothenberg, and Mark Wichlin.

Paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association meeting, Montreal, April 13, 1983. Printed in the U.S.A.

(Draft: Please do not quote or cite without permission of the author.)

The Socialization of White Females in Classrooms

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that socialization experienced by children in elementary school classrooms contributes in important ways to their socialization to race-gender roles. It uses qualitative methods (longitudinal observations and intensive interviews with teachers) to examine the experiences in classrooms of one race-gender group: white females. Analyses focus on four domains of classroom social life which contribute to race-gender-differentiated socialization: teachers' perceptions about white girls; teachers' behaviors toward these children; these children's behaviors toward their teachers; and these children's experiences in peer interactions. It is argued that for the most part white girls' socialization in classrooms encourages them to assume social roles traditionally played by white women, rather than to seek alternatives. Micro-stratification patterns within classrooms, then, mirror stratification patterns in the larger society.

The Socialization of White Females in Classrooms

The socialization experienced by children in elementary school classrooms extends far beyond the learning of their role as students. Because schools are a centralized cultural influence and have the authority to compel attention and attendance of diverse children, they are a very powerful agency of socialization in American society (Jackson, 1968). Along with the formal curriculum, schools transmit a "hidden curriculum" -- incidental social learning about norms, values, world views, behaviors, and status arrangements (Dreeben, 1968; Waller, 1932).

Some elements of the hidden curriculum affect all students (e.g., support for democratic government). Some components, however, are transmitted in a particularistic fashion so that students who vary on such characteristics as race, gender, or social class are encouraged to develop distinctive sets of skills, values, attitudes and behavioral styles -- usually those most consistent with the current social roles played by persons of their same status configurations (see, e.g., Blumberg, 1980; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Chesler and Cave, 1981; Obgu, 1978). This differential socialization occurs beneath a rhetoric of egalitarnianism, and children (and their parents) come to see patterns of differential schooling experiences as based on "merit" (see Eder, 1983 forthcoming; Ravitz, 1979; Rowan, 1982).

One of the most important set of hidden curriculum messages transmitted by public schools are those concerning gender roles and status relationships between men and women. Many researchers have documented the ways in which school curriculum, teacher and principal behavior counseling practices, tracking patterns, and testing and evaluation practices reflect and transmit to each new generation of students traditional gender role patterns. (For re-

views of this literature see Bossert, 1981; Boocock, 1980; Rickel and Grant, 1979; and Sadker and Frazier, 1973). Not only are the patterns which are overtly or covertly portrayed out of step with current realities (e.g., the fact that the majority of American women work outside the home for substantial periods of their adult lives), but they generally are more traditional than those supported by the children's parents and the community members (Rickel and Grant, 1979).

Social climates in classrooms which have implications for students' gender role socialization evolve not simply from actions of teachers and school authorities or from curriculum as many previous studies imply. Peers in classrooms also are important sources of messages which students receive about their appropriate "place," both in the social order of the classroom and in the larger society. As Schmuck (1978) has written, the average elementary school child has more contacts each day with peers than with teachers, and for many it is these peer ties which hold the most meaningful rewards.

Relatively few studies have examined the impact of peer relationships on gender role socialization, but the few available works suggest that gender-role messages transmitted by peer networks are more conservative than those encouraged by teachers and school authorities usually are (Bossert, 1981; Grant, 1982a; Guttentag and Bray, 1976). Grant (1982a) found that female students had less social power than males in peer networks and that females were encouraged by peers to play helpmate/caretaker roles, rather than to advance their own work.

Socialization to gender roles in classrooms also is cross-cut by race, and one must take into account the combined effects of race-gender status in assessing students' classroom experiences and their meanings for children's socialization. Only a small body of work has attempted to assess the combined effects of race-gender status, and it is difficult to compare these studies because of their variability in scope, focus, method, and age-grade level of

children studied. However, a number of writers suggest that children's lives in classrooms are affected in systematic ways by their combined race-gender status and that both these characteristics must be taken into account in considering their socialization in these settings (see, e.g., Abbott, 1981; Carew and Lightfoot, 1979; Grant, 1981 Grant, 1982 ; Hare, 1980; Schofield, 1982; and Schofield and Francis, 1982). These works suggest that males, and particularly minority males, might have more difficult times than females with achievement and with relationships with teachers. In contrast, females (and particularly white females) might have more difficulties with self-esteem, academic self-esteem, and relationships with peers.

This paper examines the socialization over time in classrooms of one race-gender group: white females. It is drawn from a larger study of four race-gender groups (Grant, 1981), so it compares these children's experiences to those of other race-gender groups where it is useful to do so. The paper traces the multidimensional, repetitive features of white girls' experiences in classrooms which have implications for roles which they play in those settings and for their socialization to adult roles. It argues that white girls are directed toward a certain "place" within classrooms. The roles which they play in classrooms, and the behaviors, skills, and outlooks they acquire in doing so, for the most part prepare them to assume roles traditionally played by adult white women. These children's position in the micro-stratification system of elementary school classrooms thus replicates and reinforces the position of persons of their status configurations in other areas of social life. Before outlining the study in detail, it is useful to review briefly prior research on white girls' classroom experiences. As noted previously, few studies have considered combined race-gender status. Furthermore, most studies of classroom interaction have been carried out in all-white or mostly-white classrooms (see Grant 1981 , chapter 2). Thus, most of the literature on females'

experiences in classroom interaction in fact chronicles the experiences of white girls.

Previous Research on the Classroom Socialization of Females

At first glance white females appear to be the most favored group in elementary school classrooms. White girls earn better grades and perform at higher levels on standardized tests than do other race-gender children, dominate the highest academic tracks, avoid most readily placement in special education classes, and receive the least discipline from teachers and principals (see, e.g., Boocock, 1980; Sadker and Frazier, 1973; Lee and Gropper, 1974). Furthermore, the day-to-day studies of classroom interactions revealed that females are more apt to be praised by teachers than are males (Boocock, 1980; Bossert, 1981). So favorable seemed the status of female students (and especially white females) that some educators and social scientists in the 1960's and 1970's became concerned that boys were being "emasculated" by the feminine-controlled world of elementary schools and needed special attention (Goldman and May, 1970; Sexton, 1969).

In part in response to the feminist movement, however, social scientists reexamined classroom interactions and suggested that white females' apparent ascendant status came at an often-stiff price. Many noted that although females received more praise than males, it was their behavior, not their academic work, which was praised. Males got the lion's share of the teachers' attentions (both positive and negative), especially when it came to academic work. Furthermore, many writers suggested that the loyalty, deference to the teacher, and obedience which these children were encouraged to develop through teacher reward practices made them overly dependent on pleasing authorities and diminished their willingness to take risks, meet intellectual challenges, or engage in creative, autonomous modes of learning (see Sadker and Frazier,

1973; Lee and Gropper, 1974; Levy and Stacey, 1973). As Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have noted, it is these latter sorts of activities -- not the careful performance of routine tasks to fit precise teacher directions -- which encourage development of intelligence.

Furthermore, the autonomous mode of learning becomes increasingly important as one progresses upward in the educational system (Scrupski, 1975). Autonomy and self-direction also are required skills in the highest-status adult social and occupational roles (Kohn, 1969). Obedience and docility might pay off for females in elementary schools, but these tracts could have a boomerang effect later in life, where the nature of the task and the requisite attributes changed.

As Sadker and Frazier (1973, p.96) have written:

> Neatness and conformity, docility, these qualities for which the young girl receives good grades and teacher praise, have little to do with active intellectual curiosity, analytical problem solving, and the ability to cope with challenging material. For good grades and teacher praise, the grade school girl relinquishes the courage that it takes to grapple with difficult material. The naive young bargainer of seven or eight has made an exchange which will cost her dearly. (p. 96)

Despite their successful academic performances and high ratios of teacher praise, female students, and especially white females, do not have high self-esteem, school-related self-esteem, or expectations for future academic success in comparison to males (see, e.g., Hare, 1979; Simmons et al., 1979; Dweck, 1975; Dweck and associates, 1975, 1976, 1978). Dweck and colleagues' studies show that when girls are successful in academic work, they tend to attribute that success to situational factors (ease of task, luck), so that their suc-

cesses do not necessarily translate into expectations for future success. When girls fail, however, they attribute their shortcomings to ability, perhaps reinforcing failure expectancies. Males show reverse attribution patterns, taking credit for their own successes but dismissing their failures as the results of transitory factors such as luck or lack of effort. For them, successes bolster expectations for future success. Conversely, failures are dismissed as atypical and do not carry implications for self-assessments. Several researchers have offered evidence that these gender differences in attribution patterns reflect in part the types of messages which children receive about performances from teachers and from parents (see, e.g., Parsons et al, 1982; Deaux, 1975). These attribution patterns are consistent with studies which show that females, and in particular white females, have lower self-esteem and academic self-esteem than other race-gender children, despite the white girls' superior performances and higher grades.

Lee and Gropper (1974) have proposed that elementary school boys and girls exhibit different levels of system dependence and independence. System dependence refers to (a) a child's tendency to accept and obey teachers' rules and (b) a child's psychic identity with teachers and school systems, so that these sources become central referents for forming self-perceptions about ability and self-worth.

Lee and Gropper believe that in most instances female students are more system dependent than are males. While some of the females' system dependence reflects gender-differentiated socialization practices of the children's families, Lee and Gropper (1974) believe that schooling practices enhance and magnify the system dependence of girls and the system independence of boys. They propose the existence of distinctive feminine and masculine cultures within classrooms. Children in each domain exhibit different levels and types of attachment to the social system of the classroom.

Lee and Gropper's assessments of the implications of system dependence or system independence for children parallels Sadker's and Frazier's. They argue that female students gain rewards for loyalty and obedience, but forego active, daring modes of learning, lest they risk teacher approbation. Male students, in contrast, suffer unnecessary personal stress during the early elementary school years, which might inhibit their learning during this period, but they develop active, autonomous modes of learning. Furthermore, they become more self-monitoring, in comparison to girls, and teachers and school authorities become less central mediators of their expectations for future performances.

Girls also appear to be less powerful than boys in peer networks (Grant, 1981a). Girls give more aid and comfort to peers than they receive in return and they absorb more hostility and aggression than they initiate. Cohen et al. (1976) found that experimentally-induced dominance was more difficult to maintain among female children than among males. Schofield (1982) found that male students had broader peer networks than did females in a desegregated junior high school. Furthermore, white females were more inclined than other students to feel intimidated by some classmates (Schofield, 1982). Patchen (1982) found a similar pattern among high school students.

Thus, it appears that the conclusion that white females are always the most privileged students in elementary school settings requires reassessment and modification. While white girls might be advantaged in some aspects of teacher-student relationships, their relationships with teachers have costs as well as benefits. Furthermore, they are substantially less privileged in peer, as compared with teacher, relationships. Since so great a portion of time is spent with peers rather than teachers, these peer relations make important contributions to the overall socialization of white girls in classroom settings.

Goals of this Paper

This paper examines white girls' socialization in classrooms by focusing on their repetitive experiences in four interrelated domains: teachers' perceptions of white females; teachers' behaviors toward these children; white girls' behavior toward teachers; and these childrens's experiences in peer networks. Although separable heuristically, these domains are inextricably bound. Qualitative methods are useful in tracing the contingent processes by which all these factors influence white girls' socialization.

Data Sources and Methods

The early elementary school socialization of white females was examined here by completing longitudinal, nonparticipant observations in five desegregated first grade classrooms and intensive interviews with teachers about children's academic skills and social relationships. The classrooms were located in two separate schools in two districts. Both schools served working class communities just outside a large Midwestern city. Two classrooms (Avery's and Maxwell's, at Bass School) were observed during the 1979-80 school year from October through April. Three (Todd's, Horton's, and Delby's, at Dawson School) were observed from September through March during the 1980-81 school year. Table 1 summarizes characteristics of each classroom and school. Teachers Todd and Horton were black; the other teachers were white.

Both schools were located in school districts with an 80 percent or greater white pupil enrollment. However, the schools included in this study had larger enrollments of black students than their district-wide averages. Each drew white students and black students from lower socio-economic neighborhoods, as well as white students and black students from working and lower middle class homes. Neither district enrolled 1 percent or more of any other ethnic group of students.

Schools were selected because of their geographical proximity to the author, because staff agreed to participate in the project, and because they offered classrooms with at least a 20 percent minority enrollment. Of 7 possible classrooms identified for inclusion in the study, one was eliminated because the teacher refused participation. A second classroom was observed, but since it contained no white females, it is not discussed in this paper. Table 2 shows proportions of children of each race-gender group included in the five classrooms analyzed in this paper.

White enrollments in the classrooms ranged from 42 to 80 percent, with white females constituting 35 percent of all students observed. Observation sessions lasted from 20 to 90 minutes and covered all regularly scheduled classroom activities, as well as a smaller proportion of time in informal activities such as lunch or recess. Notes taken during observation sessions were expanded into detailed, time-sequential ethnographic field notes, usually within 24 hours. The Bass School classrooms were observed for 30 hours total, while those at Dawson school were observed for 20 hours.

Teachers were interviewed toward the end of the observation sessions in each classroom. One teacher -- Avery -- declined to participate in interviews but made numerous spontaneous comments about students which were recorded in observational notes.

Teachers' Perceptions of White Female Students

Teachers' perceptions of white female students were important clues to their expectations about these children and the types of interpretations they applied to white girls' behaviors. Perceptions were appraised through open-ended questions about each child in intensive interviews. Teachers responded to two questions: "Tell me about [Child's Name]'s academic performance and skills" and "Tell me about [Child's Name]'s relationships with other children

in the class." The form of the questions allowed discernment both of the direction of the teachers' assessments and the criteria they believed relevant in discussing children of each race-gender group." Several themes emerged in teachers' perceptions about white girls, in comparison to other children.

Academic Skills: The four teachers who agreed to interviews rated white girls' academic skills as higher, on the average, than those of all other race-gender students. However, the teachers' encapsulated in to their discussions of these children's skills numerous comments on personal grooming and demeanor much more frequently than they mentioned these criteria for other race-gender students.

Three of the four teachers interviewed stated directly that they held consistently higher expectations for girls' performances in comparison to boys. (Teacher Horton was the exception and made no statement of this sort.) Teacher Maxwell, for example, seemed to set performance expectations for the entire class based on the proportion of female enrollment. In noting that her class this year performed better overall than the one she had had the previous year, she added: "But I have more girls this year." She then named four students, all white females, whom she regarded as especially able students. Teacher Avery made the spontaneous comment that she knew she would have a difficult year, "when I saw how many boys I had on the roll."

Overall the four teachers who were interviewed singled out 14 students with superlatives such as "my best," "one of my best," or "among my brightest" students. Ten of these were white females, although white females overall constituted only 35 percent of their enrollments. Teacher Horton identified one black female and one white male as "one of my best," along with two white females. Teacher Delby, who identified two white males as unusually able, was the only other teacher to single out students other than white girls with such praise. Delby praised highly the skills of two white male students.

students. Teacher Horton was an exception. Her comments about children's performances were focused tightly on their academic skills.

Teachers often mentioned family background in evaluating all race-gender students' performances. This theme was reflected in greater than 70 percent of the interviews, most frequently in response to the question about social relationships. However, conformity to rules, personal demeanor, and grooming were mentioned more frequently for white females than for other race-gender groups. Although teachers often spoke of black females' social skills in describing academic performances (see Grant 1982), they mentioned grooming or personal demeanor ("so polite," "so beautifully dressed") in less than 25 percent of their discussions about black females in contrast to 65 percent when they discussed white girls. These characteristics were mentioned in less than 15 percent of the discussions concerning males of either race, and then only when the teachers' evaluations were negative (e.g., "He looks so poorly cared-for. Some days he comes to school without socks.").

These themes were apparent in the previously quoted descriptions of Clarissa and Gillian. They also are apparent in teacher Delby's response to a request to describe the academic skills of Audra:

> All I can say about her is that it's surely good that we're living in an era of Women's Lib. She says she wants to be a Bronco Buster. Can you imagine that? She wears jeans all the time, always too big, shirt always hanging out, hair a mess...I'm not sure I could get a comb through it if she would stand still to let me try. I think she has several older brothers...I just don't know what will become of her...On top of everything else, she never seems to listen to what I say. Maybe she doesn't mean to disobey, but she just doesn't hear

> me when I tell her when to line up or where to turn in her paper.

Almost as an afterthought, Delby mentioned that Audra was an average performer in reading and in math.

In a similar vein, teacher Maxwell responded to the query about Regina's academic performance and skills by focusing on her failure to follow rules:

> She's really a case. Yesterday she used the wrong kind of paper for printing. And she didn't ever try to illustrate her work sheet. She often knows the answers, but her work is so careless. It doesn't matter how many times I tell her how to do it.

Horton never mentioned rule conformity in her discussions of any children's academic skills. However, the other three interviewed teachers mentioned it in slightly greater than one-third of their responses about white females' academic skills. This was more than twice as often as the theme appeared for black females, the second-most common group to draw such comments (14 percent) in discussions about academic skills.

Assessments of Greater Maturity: Teachers also expected white females to be more mature, cognitively advanced, or "ready for school" than other children. These phrases were mentioned in 20 percent of the assessments of white females. Only two white males and one black female were so identified. No black males were described by such phrases.

The expectation for greater maturity of white girls had some positive and some negative effects, however. Some teachers were inclined to give the benefit of the doubt to white girls in placing them in academic tracks. Maxwell, for instance, discussed her decision to place Abigail in the higher of two possible reading groups because:

> She seemed mature, a hard worker . . . and girls will often try to keep up. She had friends in that group and she really wanted to keep up with them. . . . I decided to give her a try with the top group.

Abigail remained in that group, and the teacher said she needed "only a little extra help to get her started." Delby justified a decision to place a white female transfer student in the higher of two possible reading groups because "Girls are usually ready to do first-grade work and can catch up fast."

Sometimes the expectations for greater maturity worked to white girls' disadvantage. When teachers disapproved of academic performances or social behaviors of white females and formed initially negative judgments about them, these judgments were unlikely to be altered. These supposedly mature children were seen as controlling their own actions and behaving in accordance with fixed internal personal qualities. The teachers therefore attributed their poor performances or behaviors to personal qualities or true abilities. With other race-gender students they more frequently attributed negative performances to situational or unstable factors -- immaturity, problems in adjusting to school, home or personal problems, etc. These latter sorts of attributions admitted the possibility of change. White females seemed to be viewed as unlikely to change, since their performances reflected their "mature" personalities. Teacher Todd, who always gave situational attributions about children's negative performances,was an exception.

Two instances in Delby's classroom three days apart illustrated this attributional difference. Each involved the teacher's discovery that one child possessed materials belonging to and reported missing by another. Delby offered strikingly different private accounts for the behavior of each

child. She noted that Ralph (black male) was "having some trouble at home, acting out, and being a little forgetful of our rules about asking permission for borrowing." In contrast, Delby characterized Candace as "a very sneaky person" and said she felt she had to "keep an eye on her all the time." Delby then responded to a question that each child had possessed other children's materials on two previous occasions, as far as she knew.

Teacher Horton's comments about two students whom she dropped from her top to her second reading group for their poor oral reading skills and test performances also pointed up these attributional differences. She first discussed the demotion of Patrick (white male):

> He's got the ability, I know that. I just don't think the family treats school work as if it is very important. They all take Karate lessons and are involved in a lot of sports. He often does that at night instead of the homework. . . . He seems not to get the right kind of discipline to complete homework. Maybe this [the demotion] will wake him up and he'll start working like he could be working.

In contrast, her remarks about Sally (white female) stressed the child's personal qualities and abilities as explanations for her poor performance:

> I'm not sure what it is about her. She's been a frustration to me. She's probably bright enough, although I'm not sure, but she's very lazy and very willful. . . . All she wants to do all day long is japper away with her friends. Sometimes she gives me the most spiteful look when I remind her to get back to work.

Not only does this explanation imply that Sally (and not her parents or home life) is responsible for her poor performance, but it also implies that she is showing intentional resistance by performing at a level lower than Horton believed possible.

Good Girls and Bad Girls: Related to teachers' expectations and attributional styles about white females was the good girl/bad girl dichotomy which appeared in four of the five classrooms. Each classroom had one, or more commonly two, white females who became defined by teachers as "bad girls." Teachers described these children in terms similar to the above-quoted description of Sally: willful, spiteful, seemingly deliberate and calculating in their misbehaviors or lack of conformity to procedural rules. They also disciplined these children more frequently and more hostily than other white girls. Sometimes these girls were singled out of groups of misbehaving students for especial sanctions. They were pointed out to classmates as exemplars of poor academic performances and/or undesirable behaviors. Teachers held strong negative expectations for their future academic performances, even when the teachers thought these girls had average or better abilities. Included were such descriptions as "a real time-waster if I ever saw one," "badly overrated in ability by her parents," "a real frustration ; I'll be glad when she moves to another class," "a manipulator and trouble maker from day one." All these descriptions implied intentional nonconformity by these children. Only one other child, the sole Hispanic male in Avery's class, was described in similar terms. Seven identifiable "bad girls" appeared in four classrooms; Todd's classroom was an exception and seemingly had none.

With the bad girls, in contrast to other children, minor misbehaviors such as whispering or dropping pencils, were evaluated as indications of moral-level defects, as in Delby's description of Candace. The tone and

intensity of the descriptions suggested that teachers were quite unlikely to alter them.

Teachers used these children as examples of poor behavior and held them up to embarrassment before their classmates, as in Avery's angry reprimand of Maura:

> Wonderful, Maura. You've just shown everybody the WRONG way to come back from lunch. . . . Walking around the room, mouth flapping, ... If anybody wants to break all the rules, just look at Maura . . . then we won't have any recess at all.

Of the nine students used at various times as exemplars of inappropriate behaviors and subjected to strong, sarcastic public criticisms by teachers, all but two were white females.

Observations suggested that white females in most classrooms were subjected to extreme judgments. In comparison to other race-gender students, they rarely were described as "average." However, teachers put narrower tolerance limits around acceptable behaviors and performances for white girls than for other students. If these children misbehaved or failed to conform to teacher expectations, they seemed to be judged more sternly than other race-gender peers.

The good girl/bad girl dichotomy which appeared for the white girls was consistent with what Fox (1977) has described as a societal bias toward judging adult women, in contrast to men, as either good or evil, with little middle ground. Fox argued that the fear of losing the good girl label became a powerful means of social control over the behavior of girls and made direct restraints unnecessary. Another possibility, also consistent with Fox's interpretation, is that teachers used tactics of extreme criticism with white

females because they worked with them more so than other race-gender groups. "Bad girls," however, rarely became more popular with teachers over time as the result of negative labeling. If anything, they seemed to become targets of peers' animosity and draw away from or challenge teachers increasingly as the school year progressed.

Leacock (1969) found that students who deviated in performance from teachers' expectations -- either in a positive or a negative direction -- engendered especially harsh sanctions. Because teachers' held such high expectations for the performances of white females, those who misbehaved deviated farther from these expectations than was the case for other race-gender students who behaved similarly. Hence, they drew strong sanctions.

All four teachers whose classroom showed the good/girl dichotomy for white girls cited developmental theory as a justification for their expectation of greater maturity in girls. (Black girls, three of the four suggested, sometimes experienced "cultural conflicts" which interfered with their readiness for schooling.) Although these theories suggest perhaps one year's greater cognitive maturity on the average for boys than for girls at the six or seven year old level, teachers seemingly ignored portions of these theories which suggested wide variations within gender in maturity (see, e.g., Inhelder and Piaget, 1959).

Teachers' Behaviors Toward White Females

Teachers' perceptions of white females likely were an important influence on behaviors, but they were not the sole determinants of teacher actions directed toward these children. The ethnographic notes on each classroom provide a good basis for comparison of teachers' privately-held expectations about white girls and behaviors toward them. In some instances behaviors which are recurrent and straightforward can be summed, normed, and compared

across race-gender group in each classroom. As Becker (1958) has noted, however, such indicators are quasi-statistics, useful with more qualitative materials to enhance description. They do not constitute sample data.

Teachers' behaviors toward white girls revealed several consistent themes.

Track Placements: All classrooms used ability-divided groups for reading instruction. White females were the most frequent members of these top groups. Nearly one-third (30.9 percent) were placed in the top group in their classroom. This compared with only 21 percent of white males, the next most common race-gender group to hold places in top groups. Only one white female -- a child with a behavioral disorder who attended special classes part of the day -- was placed in the lowest reading group. Thus, track placements were consistent with teacher perceptions of ability. In these schools teachers did not have standardized test scores to use in placements of children; rather they relied on initial judgments, publisher-designed "readiness tests," and reports of kindergarten teachers, when these were available. As noted previously, teachers frequently placed white females upward in doubtful cases. Interview notes revealed only one other case in which a teacher indicated some doubt about a child's proper placement, then elected placement upward. The case involved a white male who was placed in the third lowest of four reading groups, rather than the bottom one. Teachers mentioned two cases in which white males were placed in the lower of two possible reading groups, largely because of their behavior rather than their ability. However, in the five instances in which teachers indicated some question about the proper placement of white females, all were placed in the higher of the two alternative groups, although one of these was moved to a lower group after a two-week period.

Patterns of Praise and Criticism: Despite their generally higher overall expectations for academic performances of white females, teachers did not praise these students more nor criticize them less, than other race-gender students in day-to-day interactions. Higher expectations for white girls might suggest two possible patterns of teacher feedback directed toward these children. They might either praise them more frequently as reward or criticize them more extensively to press them toward higher achievement.

Mean rates of publicly discernible praise and criticism delivered by teachers per 20 observational hours are reported in Table 3. As the table shows, the teachers varied substantially in the amounts of praise and criticism they delivered overall, and in their distributions of this feedback to each race-gender group. Depending on the classroom, teachers praised the average child for academic work from 1.09 to 3.75 times and criticized the average student from 1.15 to 2.36 times. Twenty hours constitutes only a small fraction of classroom time during a school year, but these variations, magnified over the entire school term, would be substantial. Here I have used an arbitrary criterion of .5 (plus or minus) to determine which race-gender groups were praised or criticized in average, high or low amounts. If a group fell within .5 (plus or minus) of the mean for all students, they are considered to be average, or at the mean. If they are .5 or more below, they are low. If they are .5 or greater above, they are high.

According to these criteria white females were above the mean in receipt of publicly-discernible praise in Avery's and Todd's rooms and at the mean in the other three classes. Thus, they received average or greater amounts of feedback for work in these rooms. Patterns for work criticism were less consistent. White girls received average amounts of criticism in three rooms, but were below the mean for criticism in Todd's room and above it in

Horton's. Horton, it should be noted, was more apt to criticize students than other teachers, especially those whom she considered to have the potential for high academic achievement. When interviewed about her teaching goals and strategies, she noted that she believed capable children needed to "be worked hard" to achieve their maximum potential.

Praise and criticism was not evenly distributed among all white females, however, Each classroom contained two (or in the case of Todd's class three) white females whom the teacher praised for work three or four times as often as the average child and whom she criticized little, if at all. Twelve students, nine of them white females, could be identified in the five classrooms as having asymmetrically high ratios of praise in comparison to criticism. Not surprisingly, these were the children described in superlative terms by their teachers -- "one of my brightest," "one of my best," etc.

Teachers were also likely to single out these highly-praised white girls for special "trusted lieutenant" duties which perhaps were signs to peers that they were unusually competent. Todd, for example, used printing papers completed by one of her two highly-praised white females as models for other students' works. In other rooms, they were overselected for duties such as orienting a new child, running errands to other parts of the building, and showing an adult visitor around the room. These duties might have overridden the day-to-day patterns of teacher praise and criticism, marking the white female students as favored students.

Students given special assignments operated autonomously and held positions or responsibility and authority. However, they gained this status (and presumably maintained it) by remaining loyal and obedient. They were charged with passing on teacher rules and interpretations of classroom life to new members of the collectivity and as such were faithful, self-monitoring loyalists.

Bad girls never assumed these duties. Rather, the white girls whom teachers identified in this manner drew strong criticism and often were made public examples of how NOT to do work or behave. Avery, for example, told "bad girl" Ginger of her workbook drawing:

> That's the silliest fence I ever saw. Who ever saw a fence that was bigger than a house? You must not have paid attention to what you were supposed to do, because you did it all wrong. There isn't anything on that page that's right. Now, you're just going to have to do it all over.

Work criticism rates for bad girl white females were three to five times those of average rates for other white females in their classes.

The numerical indicators of work praise and criticism should be interpreted with some cautions. First, they capture only publicly-discernible praise, omitting feedback delivered in private conversations or in written comments on papers. Second, recent works have suggested that praise and criticism are interpreted by children in complex ways (see Dweck and associates, 1978; Parsons et al., 1982; Weinstein, 1979). Students seemingly make judgments about the sincerity of the praise, and whether or not it implies reward or monitoring. Only when praise is interpreted as specific, rewarding, and deserved does it seem to have the power to alter expectations for future performance in a positive manner (see Parsons et al., 1982). Criticism likely operates in a similar fashion.

Feedback for Behavior: A common theme in the literature has been that teachers praise white females more for behavior than for performance, thus encouraging them to conform and obey but giving them lesser incentive to pursue academic work. Contrary to some previous works, this study did not find that teachers

gave white females larger shares of praise for classroom behaviors over all than they gave other students (Table 4). Comparisons of Tables 3 and 4 also reveal that, once again contrary to previous works, teachers did not praise white females more frequently for behavior than for academic work. However, white girls did avoid frequent reprimands for their classroom behaviors in all classrooms except Horton's, where they were the most frequently reprimanded group (Table 4).

Bad girls again were exceptions and were reprimanded three to four times as often as other students, sometimes in very sharp tones, as in Horton's reprimand to Joyce for turning off lights in the windowless classroom as children entered:

> What in the world are you doing? You know better than that. I can't believe it. Someone could get hurt in here. You know better than that. This is the second time this has happened this week. What's wrong with you, anyway?

The bad girls might have misbehaved more often, or teachers might have singled them out for especially strong sanctions. The processes likely were interactive, with the heavily criticized children becoming angrier with teachers and less likely to conform. Bad girls, however, sometimes were attributed with creating disturbances which fieldnotes showed were the collaborative efforts of several students. When a group of children dawdled and talked near the restroom door (which adjoined the classroom), teacher Maxwell called to bad girl Gloria: "Gloria, what's all that noise over there?" Male students of both races were reprimanded frequently, but rarely were reprimanded in ways which blamed them for other children's misbehaviors or implied stable negative traits ("What's wrong with you, anyway?").

Personal Relationships: The ethnographic notes and teacher interviews revealed that teachers tended to form closer relationships with white females than with other children. In comparison to other race-gender groups, they chatted with them more often during instructional and informal periods about out-of-classroom life. They also in interviews reported more knowledge of these children's personal lives (e.g., who took piano lessons, had a working mother, sang in the church choir, planned to have her hair cut over the weekend, etc.). Teachers also offered white girls more information about their personal lives (see Grant, 1981).

Thus, the white girls had closer, more intimate, more equal-status relationships with teachers which sometimes went beyond the formal bounds of teacher-student roles. These chats might have made white girls comfortable in the classroom, in comparison to other students, and might have enhanced their verbal and interactional skills with adults. However, the chats and interpersonal ties probably also strengthened white girls' tendencies to be loyal and obedient to teachers. Teachers perhaps confided in these children because they trusted them, but the ties thus formed strengthened these children's loyalty and dependence.

White Females' Orientations Toward Teachers

Teachers' orientations toward white females were only half the measure of teacher-student relationships. Also important were the behaviors which white girls initiated toward teachers. Here the data are more limited, based primarily on ethnographic observations, since in this study students were not interviewed systematically. Overall, white girls' behaviors directed toward teachers suggested deference and loyalty. However, they were more successful than most other students in using influence with teachers, even if they attempted to influence her only rarely.

Approaches to the Teacher: As Table 5 shows white girls approached the teacher as often, or even more often, than other race-gender children. Although not shown in the table, teachers tended to accept white girls' approaches rather than reject or put them off. Bad girls were exceptions. These children rarely approached teachers and faced a greater probability of rejection (three times as great as the average white girl) when they did.

Despite teachers' openness to approaches by white girls, these children were not as persistent as other race-gender children in seeking attention when a reprimand was threatened. Males were apt to persist through reprimands. So were black females, especially when their approach was motivated by aid sought for a peer (Grant, 1982).

Challenges: Some students raised frequent challenges to teachers about matters of fact or procedural rules. White females raised challenges to teachers in average amounts in most classrooms, although challenges were not frequent occurrences in most rooms (Table 6). White girls were at the mean for challenges in three classrooms, below in Maxwell's, and above in Horton's.

Notable about challenges raised by white girls, in comparison to other students, was their respectful, even deferential, tone. White girls (unlike many boys) did not seem intent upon embarrassing the teacher. Joyce's challenge to Horton was typical of those raised by white girls. Joyce noticed that a printing assignment on the blackboard bore yesterday's date. Joyce raised her hand and, when acknowledged, politely asked Horton to recheck the date to see if she had "forgotten to change it." White girls also attempted in some instances to turn back challenges by other students. For example, Maribeth, in Avery's class, whispered "No, please don't" as a male classmate headed off to tell the teacher that in HIS nursery rhyme

book the wording of a poem differed from the version Avery distributed as a model for a printing lesson.

Bad girls, in contrast, were among the most frequent challengers in the classroom. They, like white males who also challenged often, delighted in pointing out minor teacher errors. For example, Maura raised her hand as Avery wrote lunchroom rules on the board to point out the omission of a period. Avery scowled, but made the correction. Maura then begged to add a rule: "Don't pour soup over somebody's head." Maura's rule amused some classmates, who offered Avery such variations as: "Don't pour milk into somebody's hair" and "Don't put catsup on somebody's arm." Maura and her allies usurped the lesson for a full ten minutes, as Avery and several high-achieving white females tried to curb Maura's actions. These white girls told her: "That's the stupidest rule I ever heard. Who would do that?"

It is notable that challenges by white females occurred somewhat more often in the black teacher (Horton and Todd) classrooms, where teachers openly encouraged challenges. Todd frequently told all students to talk with her about things they did not like, and Horton admonished students:

> I may mark one of them [answers on work papers] wrong because the answer is different from the one I had in mind, but if you think it makes sense, come and talk to me. If you can convince me that it makes sense, I'll mark it right.

In these two teachers' classrooms it was consistent, then, with teacher-defined rules to raise challenges. In the other three classrooms, however, teachers clearly defined such assertions as inappropriate and reprimanded some of the students who raised them. In these latter classrooms white females (except for the bad girls who had little to lose) avoided raising challenges.

Despite their reluctance to challenge, white females approached the teacher twice as often as any other race-gender group to brag about high achievements or good behavior. White males also approached to brag about achievement, but black children of either gender rarely did. White females most frequently boasted of rule conformity ("I was the first one to have my coat hung up and my papers ready to work on.") Sixty-seven percent of their boasts dealt with rule conformity, while only 22 percent of those raised by males did. When white females did brag about achievement, however, teachers were likely to endorse their claim. When Tammy told Todd she had learned all her reading words, Todd replied: "Well, another good job of studying, huh?" When Russ (white male) made a similar claim a few momemnts later, she replied: "Well, we'll check that out in a minute and see how well you know them."

White females' patterns of approaches to teachers gives support to claims of some researchers that females, or at least white females, trade off active, inquiring modes of learning to preserve the teacher's favor. When approaches to the teachers risked reprimands, white girls backed off quickly, even if they needed information from the teacher to continue their work. They were three times as likely as were white males in the white teacher classrooms, for example, to cut short an approach to the teacher when the teacher discouraged it by a frown, a shake of the head, or some other sign. White boys generally persisted until they got the necessary information, despite the threat of rebuke.

Rule-Enforcement and Tattling: Sometimes students not only conformed with teacher rules but also became active agents in encouraging other students' compliance with teacher rules. They thus became monitor/helpers who aided the teacher with social control in the classrooms.

On a few occasions teachers selected certain students as monitors or helpers. Of the fourteen such nominations recorded in fieldnotes, nine went

to white females. These officially-designated monitors got strong backing from the teachers when they needed it. Horton, for example, asked Anna to monitor talking among a group of children who worked a puzzle in one sector of the room while Horton worked with a reading group in another area. Horton told Anna: "Give them one warning, then if they still talk, send them back to their desks." Anna followed these directions, warning then ordering back to his desk Matt (white male). When Matt complained to Horton, she told him: "Anna was in charge, and you should have paid attention to her."

Table 7 shows instances of voluntary enforcements of teacher rules on peers by children of each race-gender group. Enforcements ranged from an average of .63 to 1.57 per child in these classrooms. White girls were above the mean in voluntary enforcements in Horton's room and at the mean in Maxwell's and Delby's. They were below the mean in the two other rooms. In one of the latter two --Todd's -- the teacher actively discouraged students from taking on the enforcer role, telling would-be enforcers to "worry about your own work instead of your friends'."

Marjorie (white female) in Delby's room was typical of the voluntary enforcers. When she heard Delby tell students to put their books away and their heads down on desks, she repeatedly told tablemates: "Hurry up. You heard what she said. We're supposed to have our heads down."

White females did not enforce as frequently as did black females, however. Enforcers came most frequently from the ranks of the second-highest reading group, a common placement for black girls (see Grant, 1982). White girls who enforced most often also were in these groupings. Encorcements seemed an alternative means to high academic achievement for gaining the teachers' favorable attentions. In enforcing, children exercised influence over peers. However, enforcement also depended upon backing from the teacher to make it successful. Enforcements also demonstrated loyalty to teachers.

Tattling was another means of exercising influence over peers which required backing by the teacher to complete it successfully. In these

classrooms no race-gender group stood out consistently as the one most likely to tattle on classmates. Tattling also had variable responses in different classrooms. Some teachers punished the target of the tattle, while others punished children for tattling. What was notable about white females' tattling behaviors, however, was that they were much more apt to be successful than were those of other children. Slightly more than 60 percent of their attempts to tattle resulted in the teachers' punishing of the target of the tattle without a reprimand as well to the tattler. This compared with a 40 percent success rate for black females, a 28 percent success rate for white males, and only a 10 percent success rate for black males. Few students could tattle successfully against a white female, unless they chose a bad girl whom the teacher was likely to reprimand readily.

Enforcements and tattles carry with them an element of risk. They are means of demonstrating loyalty and support to the teacher, but they require initiative on the students' part. Each tactic sometimes engendered hostile responses from peers who were their targets, threatening to involve the student in a situation which might draw a reprimand. Approximately one-fifth of the tattling or enforcement incidents recorded in fieldnotes ended in physical aggression or heated verbal battles. Hence, white females used these tactics in only moderate amounts. Bad girls virtually never attempted to tattle or enforce, perhaps because they had less motivation to demonstrate loyalty and support and perhaps because they were more at-risk for reprimands than most white girls. Only one incidence of an attempted enforcement by a bad girl was recorded in fieldnotes.

White Females' Interactions with Peers

White girls' interactions with peers were another important component of their classroom experiences. These children's favored status with the teacher limited the extent of their involvement with peers. Furthermore, white girls were not the most powerful of the race-gender groups in the peer networks;

indeed, they seemed to be the least powerful.

Time Spent with Peers: Fieldnotes do not permit precise timing of time spent with teachers and peers. However, it was possible to determine for each classroom and for each race-gender group the relative number of contacts with teachers as compared to contacts with peers. The average child had far more contacts with peers than with teachers. The ratio ranged from a low of about 4 to 1 in Todd's class to a high of nearly 11 to 1 in Horton's. In two classrooms, however(Todd's and Horton's) white females had more contacts with teachers than with peers. In all other classrooms they had a higher ratio of teacher contacts, and a lower ratio of peer contacts, in comparison to other children. Thus, the teachers' potential for influence seemed greatest with white females in comparison to other groups, and the influence of peers less powerful than for other groups.

Patterns of Peer Relationships: White females had the most insular set of peer interactions of all race-gender students. This was particularly likely to be the case among high-achieving white females, who formed tight cliques resistant to intrusion by other children. Furthermore, more so than was the case for other race-gender children, activities in peer networks of white girls reinforced their loyalty and dependence on teachers. These children played reading group, took on the role of the teacher, and rehearsed classroom roles and procedures among themselves during many free time activities. These activities were never observed in other race-gender groups, or in heterogeneous groups of children, with the exception of one black-female group which replicated a reading group one day on the playground. Yet they were almost daily playground activities of some of the high-achieving white female cliques.

Bad girls again were exceptions. Not only did they have a very diverse race-gender set of peers, but they rarely engaged in peer activities which imitated and reinforced classroom life. These patterns were similar to those

observed for black females (Grant, 1982).

Exchanges of Academic and Nonacademic Aid: Students helped peers on work from .47 to 1.47 times in 20 observational hours in the five classrooms (Table 8). White girls were at the mean for all students in giving aid on work in all classes, except in Todd's where they were below average. These children gave more nonacademic aid than they was given by other race-gender students (Table 8). Analyses not shown here revealed that white girls received less academic and nonacademic aid from other students than they received in return. In particular, white girls gave more aid to white males than was reciprocated (see Grant 1982a). White girls' helping patterns were imitative of teacher helping patterns, and these children helped the same children who received aid from teachers.

One possible interpretation of these patterns is that white girls had a net loss in exchanging help, care, and support with peers. The patterns might also be reflective of patterns of relationships among adult men and women, in which women play helpmate/caretaker roles to men, perhaps neglecting their own achievement in doing so.

Another possible interpretation, however, is that the process of giving academic help or aid was in itself a means of gaining status. Being able to help another child indicated competence and sometimes drew the admiration of teachers. Children sometimes competed for this privilege. When Avery, for example, asked if someone would help Joel (white male) learn his color words, there was intense competition for the role among Diana (black female), Elsa and Maureen (white females). When Diana was chosen, Elsa and Maureen attempted to take over the role, until the teacher broke up a noisy verbal battle between the three. White girls Clarissa and Andrea in Maxwell's room boasted to one another about how many children they had helped. In Todd's class white girls Tammy and Gillian literally knocked over a black male child in their competition to be the first to help him tie his shoe.

White girls sometimes delivered academic or nonacademic aid in an officious manner which seemed to be designed to embarrass or insult its recepient. Hilary, a high-achieving white female in Delby's class, stopped Larry (white male) enroute to see the teacher to ask to see his paper first. Hilary checked it over, then told him in a voice audible throughout the room: "That's just what I thought. You messed up two of them. It's a good thing I checked it over."

Aggressive Interchanges: All teachers had rules against physical aggression, but each classroom had incidences of pushing, shoving, hitting, hair-pulling, poking, pinching, and tripping. Table 9 shows that white females less often were the instigators of such activities than were other race-gender students. Only one incidence of physical aggression (a hair-pulling) involved two white females. Analyses not presented here indicate that although males of both races were the most frequent targets of physical aggression, white girls received more aggression than they dispensed in all classrooms (Grant 1982a).

Verbal aggression was more difficult to analyze from fieldnotes. Although incidences of verbal aggression were recorded, it often was difficult from the observer's perspective to capture who had instigated the incident. Most caught the eye after they already were in progress. However, white girls' involvement in verbal aggression appeared to be lower in all five classrooms than did that of other race-gender students. Bad girls were involved in aggression quite often.

Interesting differences appeared between responses to physical or verbal aggression by black and by white females. Black females usually fought back against aggression, though more commonly by using verbal rather than physical aggression. White females rarely fought back and sometimes conspired to hide the incident from the teacher. In Delby's room Thomas (white male) gave Cathy (white female) a sharp slap on the arm, causing Cathy to yelp. Delby, whose back was turned, asked a teary-eyed Cathy what had happened, to which the child replied "Nothing." White females seemed to deny involvement in

teacher-disapproved behaviors, even when they were victims.

There are several possible explanations about why white girls received more of their share of physical and verbal aggression and did less about it. First, classmates might have realized that these children were less likely to retaliate than other race-gender children, and hence they made easy targets. Interestingly, the highest-achieving white females who were very closely tied to teachers rarely were targets of aggression. Bad girls and lower achieving girls were more frequent targets -- groups which perhaps could expect less support for teachers.

Another possibility is that white girls served as scapegoats for frustrations some students felt toward teachers. Since white girls served as teacher allies and imitated their behaviors, they might have been suitable targets for angry feelings but less powerful in their ability to retaliate than were teachers.

Another, more disturbing, possibility is that white girls were subtly encouraged by teachers to see themselves as somehow deserving of the aggression of other students. Their collusion to hide aggressive acts, even as victims, fits this interpretations. So did a few instances (only 8 in the four classrooms) in which teachers reacted to aggression by males by implicitly attributing some of the blame to the female victim. For example, when Maura complained that Geoffrey (white male) poked her with a pencil, Avery replied: "Well, Maura, if you would just concentrate on your work, we wouldn't have any more trouble at your table."

Thus, white girls' status in peer interactions was more ambiguous than their status with teachers. Although peer interactions might have been less central to their classroom life than to that of other race-gender students (in particular, black males), white girls' experiences with peers tempered substantially their usually-favorable relationships with teachers.

Implications

Earlier it was proposed that white females would be more system dependent than other race-gender groups in classrooms. Their experiences in these five classrooms suggest that this is a valid assessment, but only if one is careful to delimit system dependence to loyalty to and obedience to the system. White girls did not lean on the teacher or require extensive monitoring to complete work. Most worked more independently than did other race-gender students, although they usually were always in compliance with teacher rules.

The conclusions of some previous writers, that white girls are socialized into passivity, perhaps needs to be tempered. It seems more accurate to describe these children in classrooms as autonomous, but strongly loyal, functioning in a circumscribed sphere. Sanctions for deviations from expectations (as illustrated by the experiences of the bad girls) were harsh; however, if white girls maintained a veneer of obedience, they were given substantial freedom.

Teachers held high expectations for white girls. Although these children were not praised inordinantly for their academic work, they were singled out for those special assignments which indicated teacher esteem. Teachers used white girls as model students around whom to define classroom rules (or, in the case of the bad girls, to illustrate infractions of them). For those who were singled out as good models, the process further coopted them into roles as loyalists and models of compliance for peers.

In most classrooms most white females had easy access to the teacher and were able to approach her readily and also form personal ties extending beyond the boundaries of the usual teacher-student relationships. White females used this access cautiously, however, and retained deference. The high esteem of teachers, and the close relationships, likely created even more incentives in white girls to support teachers' agendas and to avoid rebellion or challenge. Bad girls, who experienced neither the benefits nor the rewards of teachers'

trust and strong personal ties, remained considerably more system independent than other white girls.

The situation of white girls in classrooms seemed analogous to that of a corporate middle manager. These children were given responsibility for a certain sector of the organization, but this was accompanied by the expectation that they would carry out the superior's plan. It is difficult to determine from data available in this study how much these behaviors reflected prior socialization and how much they reflected classroom practice. Docility and obedience are encouraged for daughters by white parents and by preschool teachers (see Sadker and Frazier, 1973). These qualities also are more consistent than inconsistent with adult women's roles. In personal and occupational roles (e.g., homemaker or executive secretary) white women are expected to take charge of specified arenas and carry out duties competently without extensive monitoring (see Bird, 1968; Epstein, 1970). But they are not expected to aspire to or compete for top-line leadership positions. This study suggests that experiences in first grade classrooms reinforces these characteristics in white girls, even if it is the case that they enter classrooms with greater proclivities than other race-gender students to obey the teacher and to remain loyal and obedient.

The costs of system dependence to white girls seemed to be excessive wariness in interactions with teachers and slight exploitation in relationships with peers. White females avoided approaching teachers to challenge, even when this meant passing up opportunities for getting help. They also usually accepted without question or challenge teachers' interpretations of fact and procedural rules, foregoing the more active, daring learning styles for fear of imperiling specialized relationships with teachers. But these children displayed considerable skill in interacting with adults and derived social and academic benefits from serving as team members and cooperating with teachers.

Conclusions must be drawn cautiously because this study is based on only five classrooms in one geographical locale and one time period. Nevertheless, the study suggests that a complex set of factors -- teacher perceptions, teacher behaviors, student behaviors, societal norms about gender behaviors as they filter into the classroom, and peer interactions -- create distinctive socialization patterns in classrooms for white female students that differ systematically from those of other race-gender students. The process is complex, and probably largely nonconscious to most of the actors involved in its creation and its maintenance. It nevertheless is powerful in its effects. The in-classroom socialization experienced by most white female students is more consistent than inconsistent with the demands of stereotypical roles of adult white women. Loyalty, obedience, low social power in interactions with peers, and competence within delimited domains all are consistent with generalized expectations about appropriate roles for adult white women.

The gender and race-differentiated socialization which develops within classrooms contributes to, even if it does not initially create, systematic differentiation along these ascribed status lines. Micro-stratification patterns which emerge in classrooms to divide in systematic ways the social experiences of children of each race-gender group thus mimic and reinforce relationships among diverse persons in the larger society.

References

Abbott, A.

1981 "Factors related to third grade achievement: self-perception classroom composition, sex, and race." Contemporary Educational Psychology 6:167-79.

Becker, H.

1958 "Problems of proof and inference in participant observation." American Sociological Review 23:652-60.

Bird, C.

1968 Born Female. New York: David McKay.

Blumberg, P.

1980 Inequality in an Age of Decline. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boocock, S.

1980 An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning. Second edition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Bossert, S.

1981 "Understanding sex differences in children's classroom experiences." Elementary School Journal 5:255-66.

Bowles, S. and H. Gintis

1976 Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Carew, J. and S. Lightfoot

1979 Beyond Bias: Perspectives on Classroom Life. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Chesler, M. and W. Cave

1981 A Sociology of Education. Access to Power and Privilege. New York: Macmillan.

Cohen, E., M. Lockheed, and M. Lohman

1976 "The center for interracial cooperation: a field experiment." Sociology of Education 81:86-88.

Deaux, K.

1975 "Sex: a perspective on the attribution process." Pp. 335-52 in J. Harvey, W. Ickes, and R. Kidd (eds.), New Perspectives in Attribution Research, Volume 1. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dreeben, R.

1968 On What is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Dweck, C.

1975 "The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31:674-85.

Dweck, C. and E. Bush

1976 "Sex differences in learned helplessness: I. differential debilitation with peer and adult evaluators." Developmental Psychology 12:147-56.

Dweck, C., W. Davidson, S. Nelson, and B. Enna

1978 "Sex differences in learned helplessness. II. the contingencies of evaluative feedback in the classroom and III. an experimental analysis." Developmental Psychology 14:268-76.

Dweck, C. and D. Gilliard

1975 "Expectancy statements as determinants of reactions to failure: sex differences in persistence and expectancy change." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31:674-85.

Eder, D.

1983 forthcoming "Organizational constraints on individual mobility in reading groups." The Sociological Quarterly.

Epstein, C.

1970 Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Fox, G.

1977 "The 'nice girl': social control through a value construct." Signs 2:805-17.

Goldman, W. and A. May

1970 "Males: a minority group in the classroom." Journal of Learning Disabilities 3:276-78.

Grant, L.

1981 "Race, sex and schooling: social location and children's experiences in desegregated classrooms." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan.

1982a "Black females' 'place' in desegregated classrooms." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.

1982b "Sex roles and statuses in peer networks in elementary school classrooms." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York.

Guttentag, M. and H. Bray

1976 Un-doing Sex-stereotypes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hare, B.

1979 "Black girls: a comparative analysis of self-perception and academic achievement by race, sex, and socioeconomic background." Report #271. Center for Social Organization of Schools. The Johns Hopkins University.

1980 "Looking underneath the central tendency: sex differences within race and race differences within sex." Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Inhelder, B. and J. Piaget

1959 The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence. New York: Basic Books.

Jackson, P.

1968 Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kohn, M.

1969 Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Leacock, E.

1969 Teaching and Learning in Inner City Schools. New York: Basic Books.

Lee, P. and N. Gropper

1974 "Sex role culture in the elementary school curriculum." Harvard Educational Review 44:369-410.

Levy, B. and J. Stacey

1973 "Sexism in the elementary school: a forward and a backward look." Phi Delta Kappan 55:105-109.

Maccoby, E. and C. Jacklin

1974 The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ogbu, J.

1978 Minorities and Caste. New York: Academic Press.

Parsons, J., C. Kaczala, and J. Meece

1982 "Socialization of achievement attitudes and beliefs: classroom influences." Child Development 53:322-39.

Patchen, M.

1982 Black-White Contact in Schools. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press.

Ravitz, D.

1979 "Colorblind or color conscious?" The New Republic. May 5, 1979.

Rickel, A. and L. Grant

1979 "Sex role stereotypes in media and schools: five consistent themes." International Journal of Women's Studies 3:164-79.

Rowan, B.

1982 "Status allocation functions of public schools." Social Science Quarterly 63:477-91.

Sadker, M. and N. Frazier

1973 Sexism in School and Society. New York: Harper and Row.

Schmuck, R.

1978 "Applications of social psychology to classroom life." In D. Bar-Tal and L. Saxe (eds.), The Social Psychology of Education. New York: John Wiley.

Schofield, J.

1982 Black and White in Schools: Trust, Tolerance, or Tokenism? New York: Praeger.

Schofield, J. and W. Francis

1982 "Observational study of peer interaction in racially mixed accelerated classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology 74:722-32.

Scrupski, A.

1975 "The social system of the school." Pp. 141-86 in N. Shimahara and A. Scrupski (eds.), Social Forces and Schooling: An Anthropological and Sociological Perspective. New York: David McKay.

Sexton, P.

1969 The Feminized Male: Classrooms, White Collars, and the Decline of Manliness. New York: Random House.

Simmons, R., L. Brown, D. Bush, and D. Blyth

1979 "Self-esteem and achievement of black and white adolescents." Social Problems 26:70-88.

Waller, W.

1932 The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley.

Weinstein, R. and S. Middlestadt

1979 "Students' perceptions of teacher interactions with male high and low achievers." Journal of Educational Psychology 17:1-14.

Table 1

Characteristics of Five Classrooms

Teacher*	Teacher Race	School	District	Number of Students	% Minority Students in Class
Maxwell	White	Bass	Glendon	28	21.4
Avery	White	Bass	Glendon	27	22.2
Delby	White	Dawson	Ridgley	20	20.0
Horton	Black	Dawson	Ridgley	21	28.5
Todd	Black	Dawson	Ridgley	24	58.3

*All teacher, school, and district names are fictitious.

Table 2

Race-Gender Characteristics of Students in Five Classrooms

Teacher (School)	White Females N	White Females %	White Males N	White Males %	Black Females N	Black Females %	Black Males N	Black Males %
Maxwell (Bass)	12	42.9	10	35.8	3	10.7	3	10.7
Avery (Bass)	8	30.8	12	46.2	3	11.5	2	7.7
Delby (Dawson)	10	50	6	30	2	10	2	10
Horton (Dawson)	6	28.6	9	42.9	2	9.5	4	19.0
Todd (Dawson)	6	25	4	16.7	9	37.5	5	20.8

Table 3

Average Number of Teacher Praises and Criticisms for Academic Work Per Student By Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Observational Hours

PRAISES

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	2.03	3.15	1.72	2.56	2.59
Avery	2.00	1.70	2.30	2.00	1.23
Delby	1.10	.89	2.50	3.50	1.42
Todd	4.40	4.50	3.40	3.00	3.75
Horton	1.16	.66	2.00	1.50	1.09

CRITICISMS

Maxwell	.75	1.40	1.70	1.20	1.15
Avery	2.00	1.00	.50	0	1.78
Delby	1.40	1.60	.50	3.50	1.58
Todd	1.06	1.00	3.40	3.16	2.36
Horton	3.17	2.22	1.50	1.75	2.33

Table 4

Average Number of Teacher Praises and Criticisms for Social Behavior Per Student By Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Observational Hours

PRAISES

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	1.57	.75	4.00	.49	1.42
Avery	2.00	3.00	.67	0	2.00
Delby	1.00	.25	1.00	.50	.73
Todd	1.17	.50	1.11	.20	.83
Horton	.33	1.33	2.00	1.00	1.05

CRITICISMS

Maxwell	9.40	15.30	10.50	17.00	12.52
Avery	8.80	9.60	11.20	7.60	9.88
Delby	10.50	15.00	3.50	25.00	12.57
Todd	1.33	6.00	5.80	12.00	6.25
Horton	15.00	11.80	13.00	14.00	13.09

Table 5

Average Number of Approaches to the Teacher Per Student by Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Observational Hours

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	8.12	9.51	5.00	6.20	8.06
Avery	8.13	7.27	11.20	1.23	7.52
Delby	6.80	3.24	6.00	10.00	6.42
Todd	8.16	3.75	10.10	5.20	7.45
Horton	10.80	8.08	8.10	11.25	9.43

Table 6

Average Number of Challenges Raised to Teachers Per Student for Each Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Observational Hours

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	.38	1.92	.67	2.61	1.22
Avery	.82	1.09	2.19	.46	1.07
Delby	.63	.37	0	1.33	.54
Todd	.50	.50	1.00	.50	.69
Horton	1.31	.70	0	.70	.80

Table 7

Average Number of Enforcements of Teacher Rules Initiated Per Student for Each Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Observational Hours

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	1.18	1.11	1.32	.53	1.09
Avery	.66	1.33	6.25	.38	1.23
Delby	1.70	1.42	2.00	1.00	1.57
Todd	.17	.25	1.44	0	.63
Horton	2.27	.26	1.58	1.05	1.15

Table 8

Average Number of Instances of Giving Academic and Nonacademic Aid to Peers Per Student of Each Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms in 20 Hours

ACADEMIC AID

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	.51	.40	1.06	0	.47
Avery	1.13	.35	2.00	.75	.83
Delby	1.80	.40	2.00	2.50	1.47
Todd	1.50	2.00	.56	1.00	1.13
Horton	1.75	.79	1.60	2.10	1.39

NONACADEMIC AID

Maxwell	.95	.32	.53	.80	.61
Avery	.47	.46	1.75	0	.58
Delby	1.40	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.50
Todd	.33	0	1.44	1.20	.96
Horton	2.28	1.28	3.68	2.63	2.05

Table 9

Average Number of Instigations of Physical Aggression toward Peers Per Student for Each Race-Gender Group in Five Classrooms Per 20 Hours

Teacher	White Females	White Males	Black Females	Black Males	All
Maxwell	.15	1.60	.27	1.30	.83
Avery	.28	1.04	1.50	.38	.80
Delby	.70	1.20	0	2.50	.96
Todd	0	.75	.67	.80	.54
Horton	.35	.59	1.05	1.31	.70